UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X

MIDTOWN VALUATION, INC., d/b/a EAST COAST APPRAISAL SERVICE, a New York corporation, individually and as the representative of a class of similarly situated persons,

Plaintiff,

-against-

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER No. 14-CV-1586-FB-CLP

CAPITAL ALLIANCE GROUP, NARIN CHARANVATTANAKIT, and JOHN DOES 1-10,

Defendants.
 X

Appearances:

For the Plaintiff:
JEFFREY I. CARTON, ESQ.
Denlea & Carton LLP
2 Westchester Park Drive, Suite 410

2 Westchester Park Drive, Suite 410 7-11 South White Plains, New York 10604 White Plai

For the Defendants: CHARLES C. DEMARTINO, ESQ. Ledy-Gurren, Bass, D'Avanzo & Siff, LLP 7-11 South Broadway, Suite 208 White Plaints, New York 10601

BLOCK, Senior District Judge:

On August 11, 2015, Magistrate Judge Pollak issued a Report and Recommendation ("R&R") recommending that plaintiff's motion for class certification be denied without prejudice to renewal with additional evidence of numerosity. The R&R recited that "[a]ny objections to this Report and Recommendation must be filed with the Clerk of the Court within fourteen (14)

days of receipt of this Report," and that "[f]ailure to file objections within the

specified time waives the right to appeal the District Court's order." R&R at 18.

The R&R was electronically served on all parties the same day it was issued. To

date, no objections have been filed.

Where clear notice has been given of the consequences of failure to object,

and there are no objections, the Court may adopt the R&R without de novo review.

See Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149-50 (1985); Mario v. P & C Food Mkts.,

Inc., 313 F.3d 758, 766 (2d Cir. 2002) ("Where parties receive clear notice of the

consequences, failure timely to object to a magistrate's report and recommendation

operates as a waiver of further judicial review of the magistrate's decision."). The

Court, however, will excuse the failure to object and conduct de novo review if it

appears that the magistrate judge may have committed plain error. See Spence v.

Superintendent, Great Meadow Corr. Facility, 219 F.3d 162, 174 (2d Cir. 2000).

No error, plain or otherwise, appears on the face of the R&R. Accordingly,

the Court adopts it without de novo review.

SO ORDERED.

/S/ Frederick Block

FREDERIC BLOCK

Senior United States District Judge

Brooklyn, New York September 2, 2015

2